REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated September 15, 2008 (the "Office Action"). Claims 1-4 and 13-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4, 13-15, 17-19, and 21-22 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 13-15, and 19-21 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1, 13-15, and 19-21, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,069,328 ("Bell"), in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2006/0168238 ("Massam"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Bell and Massam, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Bell and Massam fail to disclose or suggest detecting a presence of a powered-on network capable device that is connected to a DSL modem on a local network, as in claim 1.

The Office admits that Bell does not disclose detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device. *See* Office Action, page 3. Further, the cited portions of Massam also fail to disclose or suggest detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device. In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Massam describe an ADSL modem that searches for an Internet connection when the ADSL modem is turned on. *See* Massam, paragraph 0039, Fig. 2, reference 201. Massam's ADSL modem detects the presence of an Internet connection so it can send a particular data stream to a remote verification authority. *See* Massam, paragraph 0039. The cited portions of Massam do not disclose that the ADSL modem searches for powered-on network capable devices. Therefore, the cited portions of Massam fail to disclose or suggest detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device that is connected to a DSL modem on a local network, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of Bell and Massam, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

The cited portions of the Bell and Massam, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 13. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest detection logic to detect the presence of a

powered-on network capable device that is connected to a DSL router via a local network, as in claim 13.

The Office admits that Bell does not disclose detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device. *See* Office Action, page 5. Further, the cited portions of Massam also fail to disclose or suggest detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device. In contrast to claim 13, the cited portions of Massam describe an ADSL modem that searches for an Internet connection when the ADSL modem is turned on. *See* Massam, paragraph 0039, Fig. 2, reference 201. Massam's ADSL modem detects the presence of an Internet connection so it can send a particular data stream to a remote verification authority. *See* Massam, paragraph 0039. The cited portions of Massam do not disclose that the ADSL modem searches for powered-on network capable devices. Therefore, the cited portions of Massam fail to disclose or suggest detection logic to detect the presence of a powered-on network capable device that is connected to a DSL router via a local network, as in claim 13.

Therefore, the cited portions of Bell and Massam, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 13. Hence, claim 13 is allowable. Claims 14-15 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 13. Further, the dependent claims recite additional elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of the above-cited references.

For example, the cited portions of Bell fail to disclose or suggest that a DSL router that terminates a network connection to a remote network over a digital subscriber line after detecting an absence of any network capable devices connected to the DSL router via a local network, as in claim 14. In contrast to claim 14, the cited portions of Bell describe a master PC releasing or terminating a virtual channel VC_x after sending data along a LAN. *See* Bell, column 16, lines 65-67. However, the cited portions of Bell do not disclose terminating a network connection to a remote network. The cited portions of Massam also do not disclose this element of claim 14. For at least this additional reason, claim 14 is allowable.

The cited portions of the Bell and Massam, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 19. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest a network capable device detection module that is configured to determine whether a powered-on network capable device is connected to a DSL router on a local network, as in claim 19.

As noted above, the Office admits that Bell does not disclose detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device. Further, the cited portions of Massam describe an ADSL modem that searches for an Internet connection when the ADSL modem is turned on. *See* Massam, paragraph 0039, Fig. 2, reference 201. Massam's ADSL modem detects the presence of an Internet connection so it can send a particular data stream to a remote verification authority. *See*, Massam, paragraph 0039. The cited portions of Massam do not disclose that the ADSL modem searches for other powered-on network capable devices. Therefore, the cited portions of Massam fail to disclose or suggest a network capable device detection module configured to determine whether a powered-on network capable device is connected to a DSL router on a local network, as in claim 19.

Therefore, the cited portions of Bell and Massam, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 19. Hence, claim 19 is allowable. Claims 20-21 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 19. Further, the dependent claims recite additional elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of the above-cited references.

For example, the cited portions of Bell fail to disclose or suggest a DSL modem configured to terminate a connection to a remote network when no network capable device is connected to a DSL router on a local network, as in claim 21. In contrast to claim 21, the cited portions of Bell describe a master PC releasing or terminating a virtual channel VC_x after sending data along a LAN. *See* Bell, column 16, lines 65-67. However, the cited portions of Bell do not disclose terminating a network connection to a remote network. The cited portions of Massam also do not disclose this element of claim 21. For at least this additional reason, claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 17-18 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 17-18, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Bell, in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0174714 ("Manik"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Bell and Manik, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 17. For example, the cited portions of Bell and Manik fail to disclose or suggest a DSL router including lease assignment logic to

dynamically assign a lease to a network capable device to permit subsequent connection to a remote network, as in claim 17.

The Office admits that Bell does not disclose including lease assignment logic to dynamically assign a lease. *See* Office Action, page 7. Further, the cited portions of Manik teach that a DHCP server may be enabled with a known set of local IP and gateway addresses, and that an end user device may be leased one of the local IP addresses upon request. *See* Manik, paragraph 0026. Therefore, the cited portions of Bell and Manik fail to disclose a DSL router including lease assignment logic to dynamically assign a lease to a network capable device to permit subsequent connection to a remote network, as in claim 17. Hence, claim 17 is allowable. Claim 18 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 17.

Claim 2-4, 16, and 22 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 2-4, 16, and 22, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Bell, in view of Massam, and further in view of Manik. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of Bell and Massam fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. The cited portions of Manik fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Bell and Massam. For example, the cited portions of Manik fail to disclose or suggest detecting the presence of a powered-on network capable device that is connected to a DSL modem on a local network, as in claim 1, from which claims 2-4 depend. In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Manik describe a DHCP server enabled with a known set of local IP and gateway addresses, and that an end user device may be leased one of the local IP addresses upon request. *See* Manik, paragraph 0026. Hence, claims 2-4 are allowable.

Claim 16 depends from claim 13. As explained above, the cited portions of Bell and Massam do not disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 13. The cited portions of Manik fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 13 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Bell and Massam. For example, the cited portions of Manik fail to disclose or suggest detection logic to detect the presence of a powered-on network capable device that is connected to a DSL router via a local network, as in claim 13, from which claim 16 depends. In contrast to claim 13, the cited portions of Manik describe a DHCP server enabled with a known

set of local IP and gateway addresses, and that an end user device may be leased one of the local IP addresses upon request. *See* Manik, paragraph 0026. Hence, claim 16 is allowable.

Claim 22 depends from claim 19. As explained above, the cited portions of Bell and Massam do not disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 19. The cited portions of Manik fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 19 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Bell and Massam. For example, the cited portions of Manik fail to disclose or suggest a network capable device detection module configured to detect whether a powered-on network capable device is connected to a DSL router on a local network, as in claim 19, from which claim 22 depends. In contrast to claim 19, the cited portions of Manik describe a DHCP server enabled with a known set of local IP and gateway addresses, and that an end user device may be leased one of the local IP addresses upon request. *See* Manik, paragraph 0026. Hence, claim 22 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references as applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

12-12-2008
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)